

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

This is John Brier of Boone, NC. I would like to thank you for allowing the comment period on the 2002 biennial review to be extended. I know you are considering removing many restrictions that relate to media ownership. I am already unhappy with the current consolidation of the media. Any further consolidation will only make matters worse. The media is a service for me and the rest of the public. I think regulation is good for the people. I realize it might make it harder for companies to increase their profits, but that doesn't bother me. It shouldn't bother anyone. Because of the current media consolidation, virtually no mainstream media outlets are reporting the possible change, thus the people that need to comment don't even know about the issue! This is terrible. I found out about this by a piece done on a PBS program. They said that ABC covered it once, around 3 or 4 in the morning. Don't let it get worse. Don't pretend the media isn't already too consolidated and as a result low quality. The FCC serves the people as well, and you should take my opinion as the opinion of most people in America. If you were to ask most people if they wanted media to become more consolidated, do you really think people would say "Yes, I enjoy my media to be run by huge corporate interests from only a few different companies." I say that you know the answer. How could anyone convince themselves that more deregulation is a good thing. The communication act of 1996 was a mistake. Wasn't that supposed to create more competition between cable TV companies thus reducing costs for the consumer? Aren't there less cable TV companies today with higher bills than before the communication act of 1996? Don't make another mistake.